



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,420	05/24/2001	Soo Sung Lee	10484-022US (D/LSS-200147)	3871
7590 04/25/2005				
THOMAS M. GALGANO, ESQ. GALGANO & BURKE, LLP 300 RABRO DRIVE SUITE 135 HAUPPAUGE, NY 11788		EXAMINER SPOONER, LAMONT M		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		2654		
DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,420

Applicant(s)

LEE, SOO SUNG

Examiner

Lamont M Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/24/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. **Claims 26** is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 15, page 42, line 16, "14wherein" should probably be - - 14 wherein - -.

In claim 15, page 42, line 17, "languageand" should probably be - - language and
- -.

In claim 26, page 44 line 21, "the Web browser" holds an antecedent basis
ambiguity with reference to claims 25 and 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 19, page 43, line 11, "etc" is not enabled in the specification, as "etc" is inclusive of any one of a complete set.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14-17 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abir (6,738,827).

As per **claim 1**, Abir discloses:

A system for searching a target Web site, comprising:

an Internet network (Fig. 7);

a client computer, coupled to said Internet network, having a Web browser for providing at least one Web browser screen, the Web browser screen comprising (Fig. 7, Fig. 11);

an input box having a first or second language-based domain name inputted by a user at said client computer (Fig. 11 “address”);

a first keyboard conversion icon being clicked in order to convert a keyboard into a first language-based keyboard, the keyboard being attached to said client computer (C.5.lines 45, 46-the option is interpreted as the icon, which converts to any language);

a second keyboard conversion icon being clicked in order to convert the keyboard into a second language-based keyboard (C.5.lines 45, 46-the option is interpreted as the second icon, which converts to any language); and

a search icon being clicked in order to search the target Web site having the first language-based domain name mapped to the second language-based domain name (Fig. 11-search icon, C.5.lines 47, 48-search icon, C.4.line 63-C.5.line 21-mapping);

an intermediate server computer, coupled to said Internet network, for searching the target Web site (Fig. 7-computer server, C.7.line 2-C.8.line 17) in response to the first or second language-based domain name inputted into the input box (C.7.lines 28-51) and for providing at least one intermediate Web page to said client computer (C.5.lines 51-55, C.7.lines 28-33-intermediate server computer providing a home page); and

a target server computer, coupled to said Internet network, for providing at least one target Web page, contained in the target Web site, to the Web browser screen (Fig. 7 item 3000, C.7.lines 39-41).

As per **claim 2**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends, and further discloses said intermediate server computer comprises:

first search means for searching the target Web site having the first language-based domain name (C.7.lines 47-50); and

second search means for searching the target Web site having the first language-based domain name mapped to the second language-based domain name (C.7.lines 39-47-by mapping).

Art Unit: 2654

As per **claim 10**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends, and further discloses:

the first language-based domain name is an English-based domain name (Fig. 11-“HTTP://INTERNETDRIVER.COM”).

As per **claim 11**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 11 depends, and further discloses:

the second language-based domain name is one of Korean-, Japanese-, Chinese-, German-, French-, Italian-, Latin-, Russian-, Spanish-, Arab-, Portuguese-, Dutch-, and Hindustani-based domain names (Fig. 5-Hebrew-which is a Semitic language, interpreted as being from an Arab based domain).

As per **claim 14**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 14 depends, and further discloses:

the input box receives a keyword by the user (C.6.lines 50-67-the inputted words-“insurance life” in Hebrew, “insurance life” in English).

As per **claim 15**, Abir discloses claim 14, upon which claim 15 depends, and further discloses:

the keyword is one of first language and second language-based keywords (ibid).

As per **claim 16**, Abir discloses claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends, and further discloses:

the first language keyword is an English keyword (ibid).

As per **claim 17**, Abir discloses claim 15, upon which claim 17 depends, and further discloses:

Art Unit: 2654

the second language keyword is one of Korean, Japanese, German, Chinese, French, Italian, Latin, Russian, Spanish, Arab, Portuguese, Dutch, and Hindustani keywords (ibid-Hebrew/Japanese, C.4.line 67, C.5.line 1).

As per **claim 30**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 30 depends, and further discloses:

the Web browser screen has at least one icon linked to a domain registration management server (Fig. 11-domainnames, C.6.lines 3-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir in view of Minh (6,195,707).

Abir and Minh are analogous art in that they involve searching of the Internet for information.

As per **claim 3**, Abir discloses claim 2, upon which claim 3 depends, but lacks said intermediate server computer further comprises: storage means for storing a mapping table, the mapping table containing first language-based domain names and second language-based domain names.

However, Minh teaches having a storage means for storing a mapping table (Fig. 4 item 400). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir with Minh by having the mapping of universal resource locators (URL's) or domains, in a table. The motivation for doing so would have been to access a web page corresponding to a URL (C.2.lines 10-12).

As per **claim 4**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 3, upon which claim 4 depends.

Abir further discloses:

identifying means for identifying the first language-based domain name mapped to the second language-based domain name from the mapping table (C.5.lines 18-21).

As per **claim 5**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 3, upon which claim 5 depends,

Abir further discloses:

the mapping further containing third language-based domain names (Fig. 5 Hebrew mapping, C.6.lines 43-45-Japanese mapping, C.7.lines 13-15-data base storing third language domain names, Japanese, Chinese, Fig. 18), but lacks the third language in a mapping table.

However, Minh teaches having a storage means for storing a mapping table (Fig. 4 item 400). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir with Minh by having the mapping of universal resource locators (URL's) or domain, in a table for lookup. The motivation for doing so would have been to access a web page corresponding to a URL (C.2.lines 10-12).

As per **claim 6**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 5, upon which claim 6 depends,

Abir further discloses:

Art Unit: 2654

said second search means (C.7.lines 42-47) searches the Web site having the first language-based domain name mapped to a third language-based domain name identified from the mapping table (C.7.lines 28-41-first language identified from the mapped table, third language Japanese).

As per **claim 7**, Abir and Minh discloses claim 6, upon which claim 7 depends, Abir further discloses said second search means further comprises:

second identifying means for identifying the first language-based domain name mapped to the third language-based domain name from the mapping table (C.4.line 67, C.5.line 1, C.5.lines 18-21-interpreted as a third native language inputted is mapped to web page resource and, inherently identified for mapping in order for the retrieval of a corresponding web page).

As per **claim 8**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 6, upon which claim 8 depends, Abir further discloses the intermediate Web page further comprises:

a screen keyboard for generating a set of screen key data corresponding to the third language-based domain name (C.5.lines 37- 46-the internet via web browser, providing the home page, intermediate Web page, including the screen keyboard option for any language, including the third language).

As per **claim 9**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 8, upon which claim 9 depends, Abir further discloses:

the input box receives the third language-based domain name inputted via the screen keyboard by the user at said client computer (Fig. 11-"address", any one of a

Art Unit: 2654

plurality of language-based domain names, including a third language-based domain name, may be inputted, C.4.line 67, C.5.line 1).

As per **claim 12**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 6, upon which claim 12 depends, and Abir further discloses:

the third language-based domain name is one of Korean-, Japanese-, Chinese-, German-, French-, Italian-, Latin-, Russian-, Spanish-, Arab-, Portuguese-, Dutch-, and Hindustani-based domain names (Fig. 11, "address"-C.4.line 67, C.5.line 1, C.6.line 43-45-Japanese).

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir in view of Minh and further in view of Chang et al. (Chang, US 6,298,343).

Abir, Minh and Chang are analogous art in that they involve searching of the Internet for information.

As per **claim 13**, Abir and Minh disclose claim 3, upon which 13 depends, yet lack the mapping table further contains keywords, which are respectively mapped to the first language-based domain names, and class information related to the keywords.

However, Chang teaches having a mapping table which contains keywords, which are respectively mapped to the first language-based domain names, and class information related to the keywords (Fig. 7a-mapping table, C.4.lines 1-19, categories related to keywords). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir, Minh and Chang by including mapped keywords to the table. The motivation for doing so would have been to analyze and categorize a search inquiry prior to searching (C.2.lines 20-23).

Art Unit: 2654

9. Claims 18-21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir in view of Sheth et al. (Sheth, 6,311,194).

Abir and Sheth are analogous art in that they involve searching of the Internet for information.

As per **claim 18**, Abir discloses claim 15, upon which claim 18 depends, but lacks the intermediate Web page further comprises:

a designation box having a list of classes so that the user can designate one class corresponding to the first or second language keyword in the list of classes.

However, Sheth teaches having a designation box having a list of classes so that the user can designate one class corresponding to the first or second language keyword in the list of classes (Fig. 1, Fig. 11). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir and Sheth by including a designation box to the intermediate web page. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to choose a domain of interest as well as enter keywords to increase the relevance of the query result (C.15.lines 1-10).

As per **claim 19**, Abir and Sheth disclose claim 18, upon which claim 19 depends.

Abir in view of Sheth do not explicitly disclose:

the classes are business corporation, firm, company, private person, musician, song title, entertainer, sportsman, artist, churchman, politician, businessman, celebrity, lawyer, school, state organization, non-profit organization, institute, network manager, country.

Art Unit: 2654

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that including appropriate classes relevant to a search was well known, at the time of the invention, to one ordinarily skilled in the art. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir and Sheth with a specific list of classes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to choose a domain of interest (C.15.lines 1-10).

As per **claim 20**, Abir and Sheth disclose claim 18, upon which claim 20 depends. Claim 20 sets forth limitations similar to claims 1 and 8, and are rejected for the same reasons.

As per **claim 21**, Abir and Sheth disclose claim 20, upon which claim 21 depends. Claim 21 sets forth limitations similar to claims 8 and 20, and is rejected for the same reasons.

As per **claim 23**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 23 depends. Abir does not disclose:

the intermediate Web page further comprises: a designation box having a list of countries so that the user can designate one country in the list of countries.

However, Sheth discloses a designation box having a list (Fig. 1, Fig. 11). The Examiner takes Official notice that having a list of countries designated as search items, was well known at the time of the invention, to one ordinarily skilled in the art. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir and Sheth with a designation box including countries.

Art Unit: 2654

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to choose a domain of interest to increase the relevance of the query result (C.15.lines 1-10).

As per **claim 24**, Abir and Seth disclose claim 23, upon which claim 24 depends. Claim 24 sets forth similar limitations to claim 2, and is this rejected for the same reasons, but lacks having the target web site corresponding to the designated country if the user designates one country in the list of countries.

However, the Examiner takes Official notice that connecting a client computer to a target Web site corresponding to a selection, when a selection is made to a search means, was well known at the time of the invention to one ordinarily skilled in the art. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir and Seth by searching for a Web site corresponding to a country, from a list of countries. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to choose a domain of interest to increase the relevance of the query result (C.15.lines 1-10).

10. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir in view of Kim (US 6,014,616).

Abir and Kim are analogous art in that they involve keyboard and language operations.

As per **claim 22**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 22 depends, but lacks:
a color of the first or second keyboard conversion icon is varied if the user of said client computer click the first or second keyboard conversion icon.

However, Kim teaches a color of the first or second keyboard conversion icon is varied if the user of said client computer click the first or second keyboard conversion icon (C.2.line 56-C.3.line 25). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir with Kim by having a color scheme for an icon on an interface for distinguishing languages. The motivation for doing so would have been to monitor languages and conversion via color (C.3.lines 20-25).

11. Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir in view of FreeTranslation.com (FreeTranslation, 6/21/2000).

Abir, FreeTranslation, are analogous art in that they involve searching of language interfacing with communication.

As per **claim 25**, Abir discloses claim 1, upon which claim 25 depends, and further discloses:

another Web browser screen provided by the Web browser comprises (C.5.lines 50-55):

a first input box for receiving the first language-based domain name or a first language keyword inputted by the user at said client computer (Fig. 13-the address field); and

an input box for receiving the second language-based domain name or a second language keyword inputted by the user at said client computer (Fig. 11-the address box), but lacks a second input box for receiving the second language-based domain name or a second language keyword inputted by the user at said client computer.

However, FreeTranslation teaches having a second input box for receiving a second language based domain name or a second language keyword (Text Translator and Web Page Translator). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir with FreeTranslation by including a second box for searching information. The motivation for doing so would have been to search for information from a web browser screen in a particular language.

As per **claim 26**, Abir and FreeTranslation disclose claim 25, upon which claim 26 depends, and Abir further discloses the Web browser comprises:

second conversion means (C.5.lines 36-50-option is interpreted as the second conversion means) for converting the first language-based keyboard into the second language-based keyboard (C.5.lines 36-50).

As per **claim 27**, Abir and FreeTranslation disclose claim 26, upon which claim 27 depends, and Abir further discloses the Web browser comprises:

said second conversion means converts the second language-based keyboard into the first language-based keyboard (C.5.lines 36-50-option back to the first language keyboard).

As per **claim 28**, Abir and FreeTranslation disclose claim 27, upon which claim 28 depends. Abir and FreeTranslation do not disclose:

the second language-based keyboard is converted into the first language-based keyboard by said second conversion means if a cursor on the Web browser screen is put into the first input box.

However, the second language-based keyboard is converted into the first language-based keyboard by said second conversion means if a cursor on the Web browser screen is used to click a first option. It would have been obvious to an artisan in the field of automatic formatting of a field for acceptable input to convert the keyboard into an appropriate language keyboard for a specific language field as an automatic step if a cursor on the Web browser screen was put into an input box, by simply having the conversion option as the input field. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow language specific information to be inputted into a language specific field.

As per **claim 29**, Abir and FreeTranslation disclose claim 26, upon which claim 29 depends. Abir and FreeTranslation do not disclose:

the first language-based keyboard is converted into the second language-based keyboard by said second conversion means if a cursor on the Web browser screen is put into the second input box.

However, the first language-based keyboard is converted into the second language-based keyboard by said second conversion means if a cursor on the Web browser screen is used to click a first option. It would have been obvious to an artisan in the field of automatic formatting of a field for acceptable input to convert the keyboard into an appropriate language keyboard for a specific language field as an automatic step if a cursor on the Web browser screen was put into an input box, by simply having the conversion option as the input field. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow language specific information to be inputted into a language specific field.

Art Unit: 2654

12. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir.

As per **claim 31**, Abir discloses claim 30, upon which claim 31 depends, but lacks:

the domain registration management server is one of "Korea network information center (KRNIC)", "netpia.com", "hanmir.com", "hanguljuso.com" and "hanglo.com".

However, the Examiner takes Official notice that having Hanmir.com for domain registration, was well known at the time of the invention to one ordinarily skilled in the art. The motivation for doing so would have been to register a domain from a desired domain registration provider.

As per **claim 32**, Abir makes obvious claim 31, upon which claim 32 depends, and further discloses:

the Web browser screen further comprises an icon linked to an Internet portal site linked to free Web sites (C.5.line 65-C.6.line 2).

13. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abir in view of FreeTranslation.com (FreeTranslation, 6/21/2000), and further in view of Kim (US 6,014,616).

Abir, FreeTranslation and Kim, are analogous art in that they involve searching of language interfacing with communication.

As per **claim 33**, Abir and FreeTranslation disclose claim 25, upon which claim 33 depends, but lacks:

Art Unit: 2654

wherein a color of a surrounding portion of the first input box is varied if the user at said client computer employs the first input box and a color of a surrounding portion of the second input box is varied if the user at said client computer employs the second input box.

However, Kim teaches the cursor around the input area toggles between the predetermined specific colors representing two languages. It would have been obvious to an artisan in the field of input methods to vary the color around a surrounding portion of a first box, which indicates a language being employed, and vary the surrounding portion of a second box if the second box is being employed. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir, FreeTranslation with Kim by using a color scheme to identify a language being employed for input. The motivation for doing so would have been to display an appropriate color for the language being used by the operating system to communicate with the user through the display device (C.5.lines 9-13).

As per **claim 34**, Abir and FreeTranslation disclose claim 25, upon which claim 34 depends, but lacks:

a color of an inside portion of the first input box is varied if the user at said client computer employs the first input box and a color of an inside portion of the second input box is varied if the user at said client computer employs the second input box.

However, Kim teaches the cursor around the input area toggles between the predetermined specific colors representing two languages. It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2654

to an artisan in the field of input methods to vary a color of an inside portion of a first or second input box if either is respectively being employed. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine Abir, FreeTranslation with Kim by using a color scheme to identify a language being employed for input. The motivation for doing so would have been to display an appropriate color for the language being used by the operating system to communicate with the user through the display device (C.5.lines 9-13).

14. **Claims 35-96** are the same in scope and content as claims 1-35 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Kelliher et al. (US 2001/0037347) teaches having keywords which are respectively mapped to a first language-based domain name, and having class information related to the keywords.
- Baker et al. (US 5,210,689) teaches language translation, icon mode, and character selection mode, automatically occurring, without the need for a separate selection key being activated.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M Spooner whose telephone number is 571-272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
4/19/2005

Donald L. Storn
PATENT EXAMINER
AU 2654